



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,412	02/12/2004	Philip D. Nguyen	2002-IP-006415U1P1D1	4317
71407	7590	09/16/2009		
ROBERT A. KENT P.O. BOX 1431 DUNCAN, OK 73536			EXAMINER METZMAIER, DANIEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ROBERT.KENT1@HALLIBURTON.COM
Tammy.Knight@Halliburton.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/777,412

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel S. Metzmaier

Art Unit

1796

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 21,29,31 and 44-53.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Daniel S. Metzmaier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The reasons of record.

Applicants assert that the Constien reference lacks a "proppant composition comprising a particulate material that has been coated with a coating composition comprising a tracking composition and a resin composition" and the Constien reference discloses a proppant in a brine fluid comprising viscosifying agents. The claims are open to further ingredients by employing open transitional language, i.e., "comprising". The claims are drafted in product-by-process format. See MPEP 2113 for analysis of product-by-process claims, wherein "The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature' than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessmann, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974)."

The viscosifying agents and zinc bromide of the brine of the Constien reference would have necessarily been coated onto the surface of the proppant materials. This is further supported by applicants characterization of coating proppants (paragraph [0015]), wherein "it can be coated on-the-fly during the fracturing job treatment."

Applicants further assert the invention requires "curable resins". This is not agreed since applicants reference specific embodiments in the specification at paragraphs [0013] and [0015]. If applicants intended curable resins, the claims should have defined the resins as curable.

Even assuming arguendo that the claims were to require curable resins, the vinyl addition polymers disclosed in the Constien reference would have been expected to contain residual unsaturation in addition to the pendant (column 5, lines 26) alkenyl groups. Said unsaturated groups would have been expected to be curable.

Also, the polymers of the Constien reference may contain groups that are curable by condensation.

Applicants' arguments regarding the resin and tracer materials are adhered to the surface of the proppants have not been deemed persuasive since the product defined by the process the materials are made in applicants' claims has not been shown to distinguish over the compositions of the Constien reference.

The rejections are deemed proper and are herein maintained.

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendment to the specification has obviated the objection to the specification.